

OPINION 1804

***Cristellaria humilis* Reuss, 1863 (currently *Astacolus humilis*; Foraminiferida): neotype replaced by rediscovered lectotype, and *Rotalia schloenbachi* (currently *Notoplanulina? schloenbachi*; Foraminiferida): placed on the Official List**

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Foraminiferida; Cretaceous; *Astacolus humilis*; *Notoplanulina? schloenbachi*.

Ruling

(1) The neotype designation for *Cristellaria humilis* Reuss, 1863 made by Bartenstein (1974) is hereby set aside.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology:

- (a) *humilis* Reuss, 1863, as published in the binomen *Cristellaria humilis* and as defined by the lectotype (specimen no. 970 in the Reuss collection in the Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna) designated by Meyn & Vespermann (1994);
- (b) *schloenbachi* Reuss, 1863, as published in the binomen *Rotalia schloenbachi* and as defined by the lectotype (specimen no. 1685 in the Reuss collection in the Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna) designated by Meyn & Vespermann (1994).

History of Case 2855

An application to replace the neotype of *Cristellaria humilis* Reuss, 1863 with a lectotype designated from rediscovered original type material, and to place the specific name of *Rotalia schloenbachi* Reuss, 1863 on the Official List, was received from Drs Helen Meyn and Jürgen Vespermann (*Institut für Geowissenschaften, Technische Universität Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany*) on 29 June 1992. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 50: 202–204 (September 1993). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

It was noted on the voting paper that the publication by Meyn & Vespermann referred to in the application as '1993 in press', in which lectotypes for *Cristellaria humilis* Reuss, 1863 and *Rotalia schloenbachi* Reuss, 1863 were designated, appeared in *Senckenbergiana Lethaea*, 74(1/2): 49–272 (31 August 1994).

Meyn & Vespermann (1994, pl. 39, fig. 6) refigured Reuss's (1863) original illustrations of *Cristellaria humilis* and (pp. 176–177, pl. 39, fig. 7a, b) described and illustrated the selected lectotype (specimen no. 970 in the Reuss collection in the Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna). Meyn & Vespermann (*in litt.* to the Secretariat, May and June 1992) noted that Reuss's (1863) description and illustrations, the neotype designated by Bartenstein (1974) and the lectotype all referred to the same taxon; that the lectotype was far better preserved than the neotype; and that, following their visit to Vienna in 1988, Bartenstein had agreed to the proposal to set aside the neotype.

Meyn & Vespermann (1994, pl. 64, fig. 10) also refigured Reuss's (1863) original illustration of *Rotalia schloenbachi* and (pp. 256–258, pl. 64, fig. 11a–c) described and

figured the lectotype (specimen no. 1685 in the Reuss collection in Vienna). Meyn & Vespermann (*in litt.* to the Secretariat, June 1992) noted that Reuss's (1863) description and illustration, the neotype invalidly designated by Crittenden & Price (1991), and the lectotype all referred to the same taxon. They also noted: 'We received a letter from Crittenden in 1991 in which he admitted that they [Crittenden & Price, 1991] were 'a trifle premature' in designating a neotype for *Rotalia schloenbachi*'.

The proposals relating to *Cristellaria humilis* Reuss, 1863 and *Rotalia schloenbachi* Reuss, 1863, published in BZN 50: 203, were offered separately for voting.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 December 1994 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 51: 203. At the close of the voting period on 1 March 1995 the votes were as follows:

Proposals (1) and (2)(a) (*Cristellaria humilis* Reuss, 1863):

Affirmative votes — 24: Bayer, Bock, Bouchet, Cocks, Corliss, Dupuis, Hahn, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Štys, Thompson, Willink

Negative votes — 1: Halvorsen.

Proposal (2)(b) (*Rotalia schloenbachi* Reuss, 1863):

Affirmative votes — 21: Bayer, Bock, Bouchet, Cocks, Corliss, Dupuis, Hahn, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahnert, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Ride, Savage, Schuster, Thompson, Willink

Negative votes — 4: Halvorsen, Kraus, Martins de Souza and Štys.

No votes were received from Cogger, Starobogatov, Trjapitzin and Uéno.

Kraus commented: '1 vote against the proposal relating to *Rotalia schloenbachi* as the invalidity of the neotype designation by Crittenden & Price (1991) is unquestionable; there is no reason why *schloenbachi* should be placed on the Official List'.

Original references

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

humilis, *Cristellaria* Reuss, 1863, *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe*, 46(1): 65.

schloenbachi, *Rotalia*, Reuss, 1863, *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe*, 46(1): 84.

The following is the reference for the designation of lectotypes of *Cristellaria humilis* and *Rotalia schloenbachi*, both of Reuss (1863):

Meyn, H. & Vespermann, J. 1994. *Senckenbergiana Lethaea*, 74(1/2): 176 and 256 (respectively).